arXiv:math/0605556v2 [math.PR] 19 Sep 2006

On dual processes of non-symmetric diffusions with measure-valued drifts

Panki Kim
Department of Mathematics
Seoul National University
Seoul 151-742, Republic of Korea
Email: pkim@snu.ac.kr
URL: www.math.snu.ac.kr/∼pkim
Telephone number: 82-2-880-4077
Fax number: 82-2-887-4694
and
Renming Song*
Department of Mathematics
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801, USA
Email: rsong@math.uiuc.edu
URL:www.math.uiuc.edu/∼rsong
Telephone number: 1-217-244-6604
Fax number: 1-217-333-9576

February 2, 2008

Abstract

In this paper, we study properties of the dual process and Schrödinger-type operators of a non-symmetric diffusion with measure-valued drift. Let $\mu = (\mu^1, \dots, \mu^d)$ be such that each μ^i is a signed measure on $\mathbf{R}^d$ belonging to the Kato class $\mathbf{K}_{d,1}$. A diffusion with drift μ is a diffusion process in $\mathbf{R}^d$ whose generator can be informally written as $L + \mu \cdot \nabla$ where L is a uniformly elliptic differential operator. When each μ^i is given by $U^i(x)dx$ for some function U^i, a diffusion with drift μ is a diffusion in $\mathbf{R}^d$ with generator $L + U \cdot \nabla$. In [14, 15], we have already studied properties of diffusions with measure-value drifts in bounded domains. In this paper we discuss the potential theory of the dual process and Schrödinger-type operators of a diffusion with measure-valued drift.

We show that a killed diffusion process with measure-valued drift in any bounded domain has a dual process with respect to a certain reference measure. For an arbitrary bounded domain, we show that a scale invariant Harnack inequality is true for the dual process. We also show that, if the domain is bounded $C^{1,1}$, the boundary Harnack principle for the dual process is true and the (minimal) Martin boundary for the dual process can be identified with the Euclidean

---

*The research of this author is supported in part by a joint US-Croatia grant INT 0302167.

boundary. It is also shown that the harmonic measure for the dual process is locally comparable to that of the h-conditioned Brownian motion with h being the ground state.

Informally the Schrödinger operator we consider is $L + \mu \cdot \nabla + \nu$ where L is uniformly elliptic, μ is a vector-valued signed measure in $\mathbf{R}^d$ and ν is a signed measure in $\mathbf{R}^d$. Under the gaugeability assumption, if the domain is bounded Lipschitz, the (minimal) Martin boundary for the Schrödinger operator obtained from the diffusion with measure-value drift can be identified with the Euclidean boundary.

AMS 2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 58C60, 60J45; Secondary: 35P15, 60G51, 31C25,

Keywords and phrases: diffusion, diffusion process, non-symmetric diffusion, dual process, Brownian motion, Kato class, measure-valued drift, transition density, Green function, boundary Harnack principle, Martin boundary, harmonic measure, Schrödinger operator

1 Introduction

In this paper, we continue discussing diffusions with measure-valued drift from [14, 15].

Throughout this paper, we always assume that $d \geq 3$. First we recall the definition of the Kato class $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 2]$. For any function f on $\mathbf{R}^d$ and $r > 0$, we define

$$M_f^\alpha(r) = \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d} \int_{|x-y| \leq r} \frac{|f|(y)dy}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}}, \qquad 0 < \alpha \leq 2.$$

In this paper, we mean, by a signed measure, the difference of two nonnegative measures at most one of which can have infinite total mass. For any signed measure ν on $\mathbf{R}^d$, we use ν^+ and ν^- to denote its positive and negative parts, and $|\nu| = \nu^+ + \nu^-$ its total variation. For any signed measure ν on $\mathbf{R}^d$ and any $r > 0$, we define

$$M_\nu^\alpha(r) = \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^d} \int_{|x-y| \leq r} \frac{|\nu|(dy)}{|x-y|^{d-\alpha}}, \qquad 0 < \alpha \leq 2.$$

Definition 1.1 *Let $0 < \alpha \leq 2$. We say that a function f on $\mathbf{R}^d$ belongs to the Kato class $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$ if $\lim_{r \downarrow 0} M_f^\alpha(r) = 0$. We say that a signed Radon measure ν on $\mathbf{R}^d$ belongs to the Kato class $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$ if $\lim_{r \downarrow 0} M_\nu^\alpha(r) = 0$. We say that a d-dimensional vector valued function $V = (V^1, \cdots, V^d)$ on $\mathbf{R}^d$ belongs to the Kato class $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$ if each V^i belongs to the Kato class $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$. We say that a d-dimensional vector valued signed Radon measure $\mu = (\mu^1, \cdots, \mu^d)$ on $\mathbf{R}^d$ belongs to the Kato class $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$ if each μ^i belongs to the Kato class $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$.*

Rigorously speaking a function f in $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$ may not give rise to a signed measure ν in $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$ since it may not give rise to a signed measure at all. However, for the sake of simplicity we use the convention that whenever we write that a signed measure ν belongs to $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$ we are implicitly assuming that we are covering the case of all the functions in $\mathbf{K}_{d,\alpha}$ as well.

Throughout this paper we assume that $\mu = (\mu^1, \dots, \mu^d)$ is fixed with each μ^i being a signed measure on $\mathbf{R}^d$ belonging to $\mathbf{K}_{d,1}$. We also assume that the operator L is either L_1 or L_2 where

$$L_1 := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \partial_i(a_{ij}\partial_j) \qquad \text{and} \qquad L_2 := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} a_{ij}\partial_i\partial_j$$

with $\mathbf{A} := (a_{ij})$ being C^1 and uniformly elliptic but not necessarily symmetric.

Informally, when a_{ij} is symmetric, a diffusion process in $\mathbf{R}^d$ with drift μ is a diffusion process in $\mathbf{R}^d$ with generator $L + \mu \cdot \nabla$. When each μ^i is given by $U^i(x)dx$ for some function U^i, a diffusion process with drift μ is a diffusion in $\mathbf{R}^d$ with generator $L + U \cdot \nabla$ and it is a solution to the SDE $dX_t = dY_t + U(X_t) \cdot dt$ where Y is a diffusion in $\mathbf{R}^d$ with generator L

To give the precise definition of a diffusion with drift μ in $\mathbf{K}_{d,1}$, we fix a non-negative smooth radial function $\varphi(x)$ in $\mathbf{R}^d$ with $\mathrm{supp}[\varphi] \subset B(0,1)$ and $\int \varphi(x)dx = 1$. For any positive integer n, we put $\varphi_n(x) = 2^{nd}\varphi(2^n x)$. For $1 \le i \le d$, define

$$U_n^i(x) = \int \varphi_n(x-y)\mu^i(dy).$$

Put $U_n(x) = (U_n^1(x), \dots, U_n^d(x))$.

In the definition below, we assume a_{ij} is symmetric.

Definition 1.2 *Suppose $\mu = (\mu^1, \dots, \mu^d)$ is such that each μ^i is a signed measure on $\mathbf{R}^d$ belonging to the Kato class $\mathbf{K}_{d,1}$. A diffusion with drift μ is a family of probability measures $\{\mathbf{P}_x : x \in \mathbf{R}^d\}$ on $C([0,\infty), \mathbf{R}^d)$, the space of continuous $\mathbf{R}^d$-valued functions on $[0,\infty)$, such that under each $\mathbf{P}_x$ we have*

$$X_t = x + Y_t + A_t$$

where

(a) $A_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^t U_n(X_s)ds$ uniformly in t over finite intervals, where the convergence is in probability;

(b) there exists a subsequence $\{n_k\}$ such that

$$\sup_k \int_0^t |U_{n_k}(X_s)|ds < \infty$$

almost surely for each $t > 0$;

(c) Y_t is a diffusion in $\mathbf{R}^d$ starting from the origin with generator L.

The existence and uniqueness of X were established in [2] (see Remark 6.1 in [2]). For any open set D, we use τ_D to denote the first exit time of D, i.e., $\tau_D = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t \notin D\}$. Given an open set $D \subset \mathbf{R}^d$, we define $X^D_t(\omega) = X_t(\omega)$ if $t < \tau_D(\omega)$ and $X^D_t(\omega) = \partial$ if $t \geq \tau_D(\omega)$, where ∂ is a cemetery state. The process X^D is called a killed diffusion with drift μ in D. In this paper we discuss properties of X^D when D is a bounded domain.

When a_{ij} is not symmetric, we use a simple reduction; Let Y_t be the diffusion in $\mathbf{R}^d$ with generator

$$\frac{1}{4}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \partial_i((a_{ij} + a_{ji})\partial_j).$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} a_{ij}\partial_i\partial_j = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \frac{1}{2}(a_{ij} + a_{ji})\partial_i\partial_j = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \frac{1}{2}\partial_i((a_{ij} + a_{ji})\partial_j) - \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \frac{1}{2}\partial_i(a_{ij} + a_{ji})\partial_j$$

and

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \partial_i(a_{ij}\partial_j) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} a_{ij}\partial_i\partial_j + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} (\partial_i a_{ij})\partial_j = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \frac{1}{2}\partial_i((a_{ij} + a_{ji})\partial_j) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \frac{1}{2}\partial_i(a_{ij} - a_{ji})\partial_j.$$

Since, for any bounded domain D,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{4}\partial_i(a_{i1} + a_{1i})|_D, \cdots, \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{4}\partial_i(a_{id} + a_{di})|_D\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{4}\partial_i(a_{i1} - a_{1i})|_D, \cdots, \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{4}\partial_i(a_{id} - a_{1d})|_D\right)$$

are in $\mathbf{K}_{d,1}$, we construct X_t with a drift which is either

$$\left(\mu^1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{4}\partial_i(a_{i1} + a_{1i})|_D dx, \cdots, \mu^d + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{4}\partial_i(a_{id} + a_{di})|_D dx\right)$$

or

$$\left(\mu^1 + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{4}\partial_i(a_{i1} - a_{1i})|_D dx, \cdots, \mu^d + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{4}\partial_i(a_{id} - a_{1d})|_D dx\right)$$

as in the Definition 1.2. Then the generator of the killed diffusion process X^D in D can be informally written as $L + \mu \cdot \nabla$ where L is either

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \partial_i(a_{ij}\partial_j) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} a_{ij}\partial_i\partial_j.$$

with $\mathbf{A} := (a_{ij})$ being C^1 and uniformly elliptic but not necessarily symmetric.

Throughout this paper we assume that X^D is the process constructed above. In [14] (also see section 6 in [15]), we showed that X has a density $q(t, x, y)$ which is continuous on $(0, \infty) \times \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d$ and that there exist positive constants c_i, $i = 1, \cdots, 9$, such that

$$c_1 e^{-c_2 t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{c_3|x-y|^2}{2t}} \leq q(t, x, y) \leq c_4 e^{c_5 t} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{c_6|x-y|^2}{2t}} \tag{1.1}$$

and

$$|\nabla_x q(t,x,y)| \le C_7 e^{c_8 t} t^{-\frac{d+1}{2}} e^{-\frac{c_9|x-y|^2}{2t}} \tag{1.2}$$

for all $(t,x,y) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbf{R}^d \times \mathbf{R}^d$. We also showed that, for every bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain D (see below for the definition), X^D has a density q^D which is continuous on $(0,\infty) \times D \times D$ and that for any $T > 0$, there exist positive constants c_i, $i = 10, \dots, 14$, such that

$$c_{10} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} (1 \wedge \frac{\rho(x)}{\sqrt{t}})(1 \wedge \frac{\rho(y)}{\sqrt{t}}) e^{-\frac{c_{11}|x-y|^2}{t}} \le q^D(t,x,y) \le c_{12} (1 \wedge \frac{\rho(x)}{\sqrt{t}})(1 \wedge \frac{\rho(y)}{\sqrt{t}}) t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{c_{13}|x-y|^2}{t}} \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$|\nabla_x q^D(t,x,y)| \le c_{14} (1 \wedge \frac{\rho(y)}{\sqrt{t}}) t^{-\frac{d+1}{2}} e^{-\frac{c_{13}|x-y|^2}{t}} \tag{1.4}$$

for all $(t,x,y) \in (0,T] \times D \times D$, where $a \wedge b := \min\{a,b\}$, $\rho(x)$ is the distance between x and ∂D. Using the estimates above we studied the potential theory of X in [14] and [15]. More precisely, we proved the boundary Harnack principle holds for nonnegative harmonic functions of X in bounded Lipschitz domains and identified the Martin boundary of the killed process X^D when D is a bounded Lipschitz domain.

In general, the process X does not have a dual and therefore results for Markov processes under the duality hypotheses, like the the general conditional gauge theorems of [5] and [8] or the stability of Martin boundary under perturbation of [7], can not be applied to X directly. In this paper we will prove that, for any bounded domain D, X^D has a dual process with respect to a certain reference measure and the dual process is a continuous Hunt process on D with the strong Feller property. By using this duality, we can apply the general conditional gauge theorems of [5] and [8] and the stability result of [7] to the present situation.

After establishing the existence of the dual process, we study properties of the dual process. We show that a scale invariant Harnack inequality is true for the dual process. We also show that, if the domain is bounded $C^{1,1}$, the boundary Harnack principle for the dual process is true and the (minimal) Martin boundary for the dual process can be identified with the Euclidean boundary. One of the interesting fact is that the harmonic measure for the dual process is locally comparable to that of the h-conditioned Brownian motion with h being the ground state.

In [17] the concept of intrinsic ultracontractivity was extended to non-symmetric semigroups and it was proved there that the semigroup of a killed diffusion process in a bounded Lipschitz domain is intrinsic ultracontractive if the coefficients of the generator of the diffusion process are smooth. In [18] we will use the duality proved in this paper to show that the Schrödinger semigroup of the killed process X^D is intrinsic ultracontractive under very weak assumptions on D.

The content of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some preliminary properties of the killed process X^D in an arbitrary bounded domain D; the existence of the dual process of X^D is proved in Section 3; Section 4 contains a result on the comparison of harmonic measures and a scale invariant Harnack inequality for the dual process which is used in Sections 5 and 6 to study the Martin boundary of the dual process; and in the last section we specialize the general conditional gauge theorems of [5] and [8] to the present setting and then, using the stability result of [7], get the stability of Martin boundaries of X^D and its dual under perturbations.

Throughout this paper, we use the notation $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$. We will use the convention $f(\partial) = 0$ for any function f on D. In this paper we will also use the following convention: the values of the constants $c_1, c_2, \cdots$ might change from one appearance to another. The labeling of the constants $c_1, c_2, \cdots$ starts anew in the statement of each result. In this paper, we use ":=" to denote a definition, which is read as "is defined to be".

2 Diffusion with measure-valued drift in bounded domains

In this section we assume that D is an arbitrary bounded domain and we will discuss some basic properties of X^D that we will need later.

It is shown in [15] that X^D has a jointly continuous and strictly positive transition density function $q^D(t, x, y)$. Using the continuity $q^D(t, x, y)$ and the estimates (1.1), the proof of the next proposition is easy. We omit the proof.

Proposition 2.1 *X^D is a Hunt processes and has the strong Feller property. i.e, for every $f \in L^\infty(D)$, $P_t^D f(x) := \mathbf{E}_x[f(X_t^D)]$ is bounded and continuous in D.*

We know from [15] that there exist positive constants c_1 and c_2 depending on D via its diameter such that for any $(t, x, y) \in (0, \infty) \times D \times D$,

$$q^D(t, x, y) \ \le\ c_1 t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{c_2|x-y|^2}{2t}}. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $G_D(x, y)$ be the Green function of X^D, i.e.,

$$G_D(x, y) := \int_0^\infty q^D(t, x, y)dt.$$

$G_D(x, y)$ is finite for $x \neq y$ and

$$G_D(x, y) \ \le\ \frac{c_3}{|x-y|^{d-2}} \tag{2.2}$$

for some $c_3 = c_3(\mathrm{diam}(D)) > 0$. Now define

$$h_D(x) \ :=\ \int_D G_D(y, x)dy \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_D(dx) := h_D(x)dx.$$

The following result says that ξ_D is a reference measure for X^D.

Proposition 2.2 *For any bounded domain D, ξ_D is an excessive measure with respect to X^D, i.e., for every Borel function $f \ge 0$,*

$$\int_D f(x)\xi_D(dx) \ge \int_D \mathbf{E}_x\left[f(X_t^D)\right]\xi_D(dx).$$

Moreover, h_D is a strictly positive, bounded continuous function on D.

Proof. By the Markov property, we have for any Borel function $f \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_D \mathbf{E}_y \left[f(X_t^D)\right] G_D(x,y)dy &= \mathbf{E}_x \int_0^\infty \mathbf{E}_{X_s^D} \left[f(X_t^D)\right] ds \\ = \int_0^\infty \mathbf{E}_x \left[f(X_{t+s}^D)\right] ds &\leq \int_D f(y) G_D(x,y)dy, \quad x \in D.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating with respect to x, we get by Fubini's theorem,

$$\int_D \mathbf{E}_y \left[f(X_t^D)\right] h_D(y)dy \leq \int_D f(y) h_D(y)dy$$

The second claim follows from the continuity of G_D and (2.2). □

We define a new transition density function by

$$\overline{q}^D(t,x,y) := \frac{q^D(t,x,y)}{h_D(y)}.$$

Let

$$\overline{G}_D(x,y) := \int_0^\infty \overline{q}^D(t,x,y)dt = \frac{G_D(x,y)}{h_D(y)}.$$

Then $\overline{G}_D(x,y)$ is the Green function of X^D with respect to the reference measure ξ_D.

Before we discuss properties of $\overline{G}_D(x,y)$, let's first recall some definitions.

Definition 2.3 *Suppose U is an open subset of D. A Borel function u defined on U is said to be*

(1) harmonic with respect to X^D in U if

$$u(x) = \mathbf{E}_x \left[u(X_{\tau_B}^D)\right], \qquad x \in B, \tag{2.3}$$

for every bounded open set B with $\overline{B} \subset U$;

(2) superharmonic with respect to X^D if u is non-negative and

$$u(x) \geq \mathbf{E}_x \left[u(X_{\tau_B}^D)\right], \qquad x \in B,$$

for every bounded open set B with $\overline{B} \subset D$;

(3) excessive for X^D if u is non-negative and

$$u(x) \geq \mathbf{E}_x \left[u(X_t^D)\right] \quad \textit{and} \quad u(x) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \mathbf{E}_x \left[u(X_t^D)\right], \qquad t > 0, x \in D;$$

(4) a potential for X^D if it is excessive for X^D and for every sequence $\{U_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ of open sets with $\overline{U_n} \subset U_{n+1}$ and $\cup_n U_n = D$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left[u(X_{\tau_{U_n}}^D)\right] = 0; \qquad \xi_D\text{-a.e. } x \in D.$$

(5) a pure potential for X^D if it is a potential for X^D and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left[u(X_t^D)\right] \,=\, 0, \qquad \xi_D\text{-a.e. } x \in D.$$

A Borel function u defined on $\overline{U}$ is said to be regular harmonic with respect to X^D in U if u is harmonic with respect to X^D in U and (2.3) is true for $B = U$;

A Borel function u defined on D is said to be harmonic with respect to X^D if it is harmonic with respect to X^D in D.

Since X^D is a Hunt processes with the strong Feller property, it is easy to check that u is excessive for X^D if and only if f is lower semi-continuous in D and superharmonic with respect to X^D. (See Theorem 4.5.3 in [13] for the Brownian motion case, and the proof there can adapted easily to the present case.)

We list some properties of the Green function $\overline{G}_D(x, y)$ of X^D that we will need later.

(A1) $\overline{G}_D(x, y) > 0$ for all $(x, y) \in D \times D$; $\overline{G}_D(x, y) = \infty$ if and only if $x = y \in D$;

(A2) For every $x \in D$, $\overline{G}_D(x, \cdot\,)$ and $\overline{G}_D(\,\cdot\,, x)$ are extended continuous in D;

(A3) For every compact subset K of D, $\int_K \overline{G}_D(x, y)\xi_D(dy) < \infty$.

The above properties can be checked easily from Theorem 2.6 in [15] and our Proposition 2.2 and (2.2) above. Thus X^D is a transient diffusion satisfying the conditions in [11] and [24]. Applying Theorem 1 in [24], we have that

(A4) for each y, $x \to \overline{G}_D(x, y)$ is excessive for X^D and harmonic for X^D in $D \setminus \{y\}$. Moreover, for every open subset U of D, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_x[\overline{G}_D(X^D_{T_U}, y)] = \overline{G}_D(x, y), \qquad (x, y) \in D \times U \tag{2.4}$$

where $T_U := \inf\{t > 0 : X_t^D \in U\}$. In particular, for every $y \in D$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $\overline{G}_D(\,\cdot\,, y)$ is regular harmonic in $D \setminus B(y, \varepsilon)$ with respect to X^D.

Since the set Z defined in [11] (equation (12) on page 179) is empty, from Corollary 2 and Theorems 5-6 in [11], we have

Theorem 2.4 *(1) If u is a potential for X^D, then there exists a unique Radon measure ν on D such that*

$$u(x) \,=\, G_D\nu(x) \,:=\, \int_D \overline{G}_D(x, y)\nu(dy)$$

(2) If f is an excessive function for X^D and f is not identically zero, then there exists a unique Radon measure ν on D and a nonnegative harmonic function h for X^D such that $f = G_D\nu + h$.

For $y \in D$, let $X^{D,y}$ denote the h-conditioned process obtained from X^D with $h(\cdot) = \overline{G}_D(\cdot, y)$ and let $\mathbf{E}_x^y$ denote the expectation for $X^{D,y}$ starting from $x \in D$.

Theorem 2.5 *For each y, $x \to \overline{G}_D(x,y)$ is a pure potential for X^D. In fact, for every sequence $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ of open sets with $\overline{U_n} \subset U_{n+1}$ and $\cup_n U_n = D$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left[\overline{G}_D(X^D_{\tau_{U_n}}, y) \right] \,=\, 0, \qquad x \neq y.$$

Moreover, for every $x, y \in D$, we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left[\overline{G}_D(X^D_t, y) \right] \,=\, 0.$$

Proof. Let $x \neq y \in D$. First we see that, from (A1)-(A2), the condition (H) in [22] holds. Also the strict positivity of $\overline{G}_D$ and (A4) imply that the set W on page 5 in [22] (also the set Z defined in [11]) is empty. Thus by Theorem 2 in [22], the lifetime ζ^y for $X^{D,y}$ is finite $\mathbf{P}^y_x$-a.s. and

$$\lim_{t\uparrow\zeta^y} X^{D,y}_t = y \qquad \mathbf{P}^y_x\text{-a.s..} \tag{2.5}$$

Let $\{D_k,\, k \geq 1\}$ be an increasing sequence of relatively compact open subsets of D such that $D_k \subset \overline{D_k} \subset D$ and $\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} D_k = D$. Then

$$\mathbf{E}_x \left[\overline{G}_D(X^D_{\tau_{D_k}}, y) \right] = \overline{G}_D(x,y) \mathbf{P}^y_x(\tau_{D_k} < \zeta^y).$$

By (2.5), we have $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{P}^y_x(\tau_{D_k} < \zeta^y) = 0$. Thus

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left[\overline{G}_D(X^D_{\tau_{D_k}}, y) \right] = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

The last claim in the theorem is easy. By (2.1) and (2.2), for every $x, y \in D$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_x \left[\overline{G}_D(X^D_t, y) \right] \leq \frac{c}{t^{\frac{d}{2}} h_D(y)} \int_D \frac{dz}{|z-y|^{d-2}},$$

which converges to zero as t goes to ∞. □

The proof of the next proposition can be found in the proofs of Theorems 2-3 in [24]. Since we will refer to the argument of the proof of the proposition later, we include the proof here for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 2.6 *If h is a nonnegative harmonic function for X^D and U is an open subset of D with $\overline{U} \subset D$, then there exists a Radon measure ν supported on ∂U such that $h = G_D \nu$ in U. In particular, every nonnegative harmonic function for X^D is continuous.*

Proof. Using (2.2) and (A1)-(A2), we see that the properties (a)-(b) in [25] is true for X^D. Thus by Corollary 1 in [25], h is excessive. Let $T_U := \inf\{t > 0 : X^D_t \in U\}$. Since h is excessive, Corollary 1 to Theorem 2 in [11] implies that there exists a Radon measure ν supported on $\overline{U}$ such that $\mathbf{E}_x[h(X^D_{T_U})] = G_D\nu(x)$ for all $x \in D$. Since

$$G_D\nu(x) = \int_U \overline{G}_D(x,y)\nu(dy) + \int_{\partial U} \overline{G}_D(x,y)\nu(dy) =: h_1(x) + h_2(x), \qquad x \in D$$

and h_1 and h_2 are excessive (Theorem 2.4), h_1 and h_2 must be harmonic with respect to X^D . Let K be a compact subset of U. By the harmonicity of h_1, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_x[h_1(X^D_{T_{K^c}})] = \int_{\partial U} \overline{G}_D(x,y)\nu(dy).$$

But, by Corollary 1 to Theorem 2 in [11], ν can not charge the interior of K. Since K is an arbitrary compact subset of U, we get that h_1 is identically zero and ν is supported by ∂U. Therefore we have shown $h(x) = \mathbf{E}_x[h(X^D_{T_U})] = G_D\nu(x)$ for $x \in U$. Now the continuity of h follows from the continuity of $\overline{G}_D(x,y)$. □

3 Dual of X^D in bounded domains

In this section we assume that D is an arbitrary bounded domain. First we show that X^D has a nice dual process with respect to ξ_D and then we will study the dual process of X^D.

Recall that $h_D(x) = \int_D G_D(y,x)dy$, $\xi_D(dx) = h_D(x)dx$, $\overline{q}^D(t,x,y) = \frac{q^D(t,x,y)}{h_D(y)}$ and $\overline{G}_D(x,y) = \frac{G_D(x,y)}{h_D(y)}$. We note that

$$\int_D \overline{G}_D(x,y)\xi_D(dx) \le \frac{\|h_D\|_{L_\infty(D)}}{h_D(y)} \int_D G_D(x,y)dx = \|h_D\|_{L_\infty(D)} < \infty.$$

So we have

(A5) for every compact subset K of D, $\int_K \overline{G}_D(x,y)\xi_D(dx) < \infty$.

(A1)-(A5), (2.2) and Theorem 2.5 imply that the conditions (i)-(vii) and (70)-(71) in [20] (also see Remark on page 391 in [21]) are satisfied, thus X^D has a continuous Hunt process as a dual process.

Theorem 3.1 *There exists a transient continuous Hunt process $\widehat{X}^D$ in D such that $\widehat{X}^D$ is a strong dual of X^D with respect to the measure ξ_D, that is, the density of the semigroup $\{\widehat{P}^D_t\}_{t\ge 0}$ of $\widehat{X}^D$ is given by $\widehat{q}^D(t,x,y) := \overline{q}^D(t,y,x)$ and thus*

$$\int_D f(x)P^D_t g(x)\xi_D(dx) = \int_D g(x)\widehat{P}^D_t f(x)\xi_D(dx) \quad \text{for all } f,g \in L^2(D,\xi_D).$$

Proof. The existence of a dual continuous Hunt process $\widehat{X}^D$ is proved in [20]. To show $\widehat{X}^D$ is transient, we need to show that for every compact subset K of D, $\int_K \overline{G}_D(x,y)\xi_D(dx)$ is bounded. This is just (A5) above. □

We will use $\widehat{\zeta}$ to denote the lifetime of $\widehat{X}^D$. Note that the process $\widehat{X}^D$ might have killing inside D, that is, the probablity of the event $\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\zeta}-} \in D$ might be strictly positive.

By (A1), (A2) and (A5), $\widehat{X}^D$ is a transient diffusion satisfying the conditions in [24] and [11]. So by applying Theorem 1 in [24], we have that

(A6) for each y, $x \to \overline{G}_D(y,x)$ is excessive for $\widehat{X}^D$ and harmonic in $D \setminus \{y\}$. Moreover, for every open subset U of D, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_x[\overline{G}_D(y, \widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{T}_U})] = \overline{G}_D(y,x), \qquad (x,y) \in D \times U \tag{3.1}$$

where $\widehat{T}_U := \inf\{t > 0 : \widehat{X}^D_t \in U\}$. In particular, for every $y \in D$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $\overline{G}_D(y, \cdot)$ is regular harmonic in $D \setminus B(y,\varepsilon)$ with respect to $\widehat{X}^D$.

Thus the Riesz representation theorem (Theorem 2.4) is valid for $\widehat{X}^D$ too.

Theorem 3.2 *(1) If u is a potential for $\widehat{X}^D$, then there exists a unique Radon measure ν on D such that*

$$u(x) \;=\; \widehat{G}_D\nu(x) \;:=\; \int_D \overline{G}_D(y,x)\nu(dy)$$

(2) If f is an excessive function for $\widehat{X}^D$ and f is not identically zero, then there exists a unique Radon measure ν on D and a nonnegative harmonic function h for $\widehat{X}^D$ such that $f = \widehat{G}_D\nu + h$.

Theorem 3.3 *For each y, $x \to \overline{G}_D(y,x)$ is a pure potential for $\widehat{X}^D$. In fact, for every sequence $\{U_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ of open sets with $\overline{U_n} \subset U_{n+1}$ and $\cup_n U_n = D$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left[\overline{G}_D(y, \widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}_{U_n}}); \widehat{\tau}_{U_n} < \widehat{\zeta}\right] \;=\; 0, \qquad x \neq y.$$

Moreover, for every $x, y \in D$, we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbf{E}_x \left[\overline{G}_D(y, \widehat{X}^D_t); t < \widehat{\zeta}\right] \;=\; 0.$$

Proof. The first assertion can be proved using an argument same as that of the proof of Theorem 2.5, so we only need to prove the last assertion.

By (2.1) and (2.2), we have for every $x, y \in D$,

$$\mathbf{E}_x \left[\overline{G}_D(y, \widehat{X}^D_t); t < \widehat{\zeta}\right] \;=\; \int_D \frac{q^D(t,z,x)}{h_D(x)} \overline{G}_D(y,z) h_D(z) dz \;\leq\; \frac{c}{t^{\frac{d}{2}} h_D(x)} \int_D \frac{dz}{|z-y|^{d-2}},$$

which converges to zero as t goes to ∞. $\square$

Note that every nonnegative harmonic function for $\widehat{X}^D$ is excessive and continuous by Corollary 1 in [25]. Let $\{\widehat{G}^D_\alpha,\ \alpha \geq 0\}$ be the resolvent of $\widehat{X}^D$ with respect ξ_D so that $\widehat{G}^D_0(y, dx) = \overline{G}_D(x, y)\xi_D(dx)$.

Proposition 3.4 *$\widehat{X}^D$ has the strong Feller property in the resolvent sense; that is, for every bounded Borel function f on D and $\alpha \geq 0$, $\widehat{G}^D_\alpha f(x)$ is bounded continuous function on D.*

Proof. By the resolvent equation $\widehat{G}^D_0 = \widehat{G}^D_\alpha + \alpha \widehat{G}^D_0 \widehat{G}^D_\alpha$, it is enough to show the strong Feller property for $\widehat{G}^D_0$. Fix a bounded Borel function f on D and a sequence $\{y_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ converges to y in D. Let $M := \|f h_D\|_{L_\infty(D)} < \infty$. We assume $\{y_n\}_{n\geq 1} \subset K$ for a compact subset K of D. Let $A := \inf_{y\in K} h_D(y)$. By Proposition 2.2, we know that A is strictly positive. Note that there exists a constant c_1 such that for every $\delta > 0$

$$\left(\int_{B(y,\delta)} \frac{dx}{|x-y|^{d-2}} + \int_{B(y_n,2\delta)} \frac{dx}{|x-y_n|^{d-2}}\right) \leq c_1 \delta^2.$$

Thus by (2.2), there exists a constant c_2 such that for every $\delta > 0$ and y_n with $y_n \in B(y, \frac{\delta}{2}) \subset B(y, 2\delta) \in K$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B(y,\delta)} \overline{G}_D(x,y) f(x)\xi_D(dx) + \int_{B(y,\delta)} \overline{G}_D(x,y_n) f(x)\xi_D(dx) \\
&\leq \frac{M}{A}\left(\int_{B(y,\delta)} G_D(x,y)dx + \int_{B(y_n,2\delta)} G_D(x,y_n)dx\right) \\
&\leq \frac{c_2 M}{A}\left(\int_{B(y,\delta)} \frac{dx}{|x-y|^{d-2}} + \int_{B(y_n,2\delta)} \frac{dx}{|x-y_n|^{d-2}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{A} c_1 c_2 M \delta^2
\end{aligned}$$

Given ε, choose δ small enough such that $\frac{1}{A} c_1 c_2 M\delta^2 < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Then

$$|\widehat{G}^D_0 f(y) - \widehat{G}^D_0 f(y_n)| \leq M \int_{D\setminus B(y,\delta)} |\overline{G}_D(x,y) - \overline{G}_D(x,y_n)| dx + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Note that $\overline{G}_D(x, y_n)$ converges to $\overline{G}_D(x, y)$ for every $x \neq y$ and $\{\overline{G}_D(x, y_n)\}$ are uniformly bounded on $x \in D \setminus B(y, \delta)$ and $y_n \in B(y, \frac{\delta}{2})$. So the first term on the right hand side of the inequality above goes to zero as $n \to \infty$ by the bounded convergence theorem. $\square$

4 Comparison of harmonic measures and scale invariant Harnack inequality for the dual process

In this section we still assume that D is an arbitrary bounded domain. For any open subset U of D, we use $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$ to denote the process obtained by killing $\widehat{X}^D$ upon exiting U, i.e., $\widehat{X}^{D,U}_t(\omega) = \widehat{X}^D_t(\omega)$ if

$t < \widehat{\tau}^D_U(\omega)$ and $\widehat{X}^{D,U}_t(\omega) = \partial$ if $t \geq \widehat{\tau}^D_U(\omega)$, where $\widehat{\tau}^D_U := \inf\{t > 0 : \widehat{X}^D_t \notin U\}$ and ∂ is the cemetery state. Then by Theorem 2 and Remark 2 after it in [28], X^U and $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$ are dual processes with respect to ξ_D. Now we let

$$\widehat{q}^{D,U}(t,x,y) := \frac{q^U(t,y,x)h_D(y)}{h_D(x)}.$$

By the joint continuity of $q^D(t,x,y)$ (Theorem 2.4 in [14]) and the continuity and positivity of h_D (Proposition 2.2), we know that $q^{D,U}(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ is jointly continuous on $U \times U$. Thus we have the following.

Theorem 4.1 *For every open subset U, $\widehat{q}^{D,U}(t,x,y)$ is jointly continuous on $U \times U$ and is the transition density of $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Moreover,*

$$\widehat{G}_{D,U}(x,y) := \frac{G_U(y,x)h_D(y)}{h_D(x)} \tag{4.1}$$

is the Green function of $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure so that for every nonnegative Borel function f,

$$\mathbf{E}_x\left[\int_0^{\widehat{\tau}^D_U} f\left(\widehat{X}^D_t\right)dt\right] = \int_U \widehat{G}_{D,U}(x,y)f(y)dy.$$

Using (4.1), one can check that $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$ satisfies the conditions in [11] and [24]. Thus by repeating the argument in the proof of Proposition 2.6, we get the following.

Proposition 4.2 *If h is a nonnegative harmonic for $\widehat{X}^D$ in U and V is an open subset of U with $\overline{V} \subset D$, then there exists a Radon measure ν supported on ∂V such that*

$$h(x) = \int_{\partial V} \frac{G_U(y,x)h_D(y)}{h_D(x)}\nu(dy), \quad x \in V.$$

In particular, every nonnegative harmonic function for $\widehat{X}^D$ in U is continuous.

Using (1.1) and Proposition 2.2, we see that for every compact subset K of D, there exist c_1, c_2 and c_3 such that for every positive t_0 and δ,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\leq t_0, x\in K, |x-y|>\delta} \frac{q^D(t,y,x)h_D(y)}{h_D(x)} &\leq c_1 e^{c_2 t_0} \sup_{t\leq t_0, x\in K, |x-y|>\delta} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-c_3\frac{|x-y|^2}{t}} \\ &\leq c_1 e^{c_2 t_0} \sup_{t\leq t_0} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-c_3\frac{\delta^2}{t}} < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

(4.2) implies that for any compact subset K of D,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{t\leq t_0, x\in K} \mathbf{P}_x(|\widehat{X}^D_t - x| \geq \delta; t < \widehat{\zeta}) \leq c_1 e^{c_2 t_0} \sup_{t\leq t_0, x\in K} \int_{|x-y|\geq\delta} t^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-c_3\frac{|x-y|^2}{t}} dy \\ &= c_4 e^{c_2 t_0} \sup_{t\leq t_0} \int_\delta^\infty t^{-\frac{d}{2}} r^{d-1} e^{-c_3\frac{r^2}{t}} dr \leq c_5 e^{c_2 t_0} \int_{\frac{\delta}{\sqrt{t_0}}}^\infty u^{d-1} e^{-c_3 u^2} du\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_5 = c_5(d)$ and $c_6 = c_6(d)$. Thus

$$\lim_{t_0 \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \le t_0, x \in K} \mathbf{P}_x(|\widehat{X}^D_t - x| \ge \delta; t < \widehat{\zeta}) \,=\, \lim_{t_0 \downarrow 0} \sup_{t \le t_0, x \in K} \mathbf{P}_x(\widehat{X}^D_t \in D \setminus B(x, \delta)) \,=\, 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Using (4.3) we can easily prove the next lemma.

Lemma 4.3 *For any $\delta > 0$ and $x \in D$ with $B(x, 2\delta) \in D$, we have*

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in D : B(x, 2\delta) \in D} \mathbf{P}_x(\widehat{\tau}^D_{B(x,\delta)} \le s \wedge \widehat{\zeta}) \,= 0.$$

Proof. For any $t > 0$ and any Borel set A in D, we put $N_t(x, A) = \mathbf{P}_x(\widehat{X}^D_t \in A)$. Then by an extended version of the strong Markov property (see page 43–44 of [3]), we have for every $x \in D$ with $B(x, 2\delta) \in D$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}_x(\widehat{\tau}^D_{B(x,\delta)} \le s \wedge \widehat{\zeta}) &\le \mathbf{P}_x \left(\widehat{\tau}_{B(x,\delta)} \le s,\, \widehat{X}_s \in B(x, \frac{\delta}{2}) \right) \,+\, \mathbf{P}_x \left(\, \widehat{X}^D_s \in B(x, \frac{\delta}{2})^c, s < \widehat{\zeta} \right) \\
&\le \mathbf{E}_x \left[N_{s - \widehat{\tau}^D_{B(x,\delta)}} \left(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}_{B(x,\delta)}}, B(x, \frac{\delta}{2}) \right) ;\, \widehat{\tau}^D_{B(x,\delta)} \le s \right] \,+\, \mathbf{P}_x \left(\, \widehat{X}^D_s \in B(x, \frac{\delta}{2})^c, s < \widehat{\zeta} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $X^D_{\tau_{B(x,\delta)}} \in \partial B(x, \delta)$ almost surely on $\{\widehat{\tau}_{B(x,\delta)} < \widehat{\zeta}\}$, the conclusion of the lemma follows from (4.3). □

A bounded domain U in $\mathbf{R}^d$ is said to be a $C^{1,1}$ domain if there is a localization radius $r_0 > 0$ and a constant $\Lambda > 0$ such that for every $Q \in \partial U$, there is a $C^{1,1}$-function $\phi = \phi_Q : \mathbf{R}^{d-1} \to \mathbf{R}$ satisfying $\phi(0) = \nabla\phi(0) = 0$, $\|\nabla\phi\|_\infty \le \Lambda$, $|\nabla\phi(x) - \nabla\phi(z)| \le \Lambda|x - z|$, and an orthonormal coordinate system $y = (y_1, \cdots, y_{d-1}, y_d) := (\tilde{y}, y_d)$ such that $B(Q, r_0) \cap D = B(Q, r_0) \cap \{y : y_d > \phi(\tilde{y})\}$.

Using (1.3), it is easy to show the following.

Proposition 4.4 *For any bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain $U \subset D$ with $\overline{U} \subset D$, $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$ satisfies the strong Feller property in the semigroup sense; that is, for every bounded Borel function f on U ,*

$$\mathbf{E}_x \left[f(\widehat{X}^D_t); t < \widehat{\tau}^D_U \right]$$

is a bounded continuous function on U.

Proof. Fix $x_0 \in U$ and $t > 0$. Suppose $x_n \in U$ converges to $x_0 \in U$. Let $N := \inf_{n \ge 1} h_D(x_n) > 0$ Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathbf{E}_{x_n} \left[f(\widehat{X}^D_t); t < \widehat{\tau}^D_U \right] - \mathbf{E}_{x_0} \left[f(\widehat{X}^D_t); t < \widehat{\tau}^D_U \right] \right| \\
\le\;& c_1 \int_U \left| \frac{q^U(t, y, x_n)}{h_D(x_n)} - \frac{q^U(t, y, x_0)}{h_D(x_0)} \right| h_D(y) dy \\
\le\;& c_2 \int_U \left(\left| \frac{q^U(t, y, x_n)}{h_D(x_n)} - \frac{q^U(t, y, x_0)}{h_D(x_n)} \right| + q^U(t, y, x_0) \left| \frac{1}{h_D(x_n)} - \frac{1}{h_D(x_0)} \right| \right) dy \\
\le\;& \frac{c_2}{N} \int_U \left| q^U(t, y, x_n) - q^U(t, y, x_0) \right| dy + c_2 \left| \frac{1}{h_D(x_n)} - \frac{1}{h_D(x_0)} \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Given $\varepsilon > 0$, choose $n_0 > 0$ such that

$$c_2 \left| \frac{1}{h_D(x_n)} - \frac{1}{h_D(x_0)} \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}, \quad n \geq n_0.$$

Let $\rho_U(y)$ be the distance between y and ∂D. By (1.3),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_U \left| q^U(t,y,x_n) - q^U(t,y,x_0) \right| dy \\
&= \left(\int_{\{y \in U: \rho_U(y) < \delta\}} + \int_{\{y \in U: \rho_U(y) \geq \delta\}} \right) \left| q^U(t,y,x_n) - q^U(t,y,x_0) \right| dy \\
&\leq c_3 \, |U| \, \delta t^{-\frac{d+1}{2}} + \int_{\{y \in U: \rho_U(y) \geq \delta\}} \left| q^U(t,y,x_n) - q^U(t,y,x_0) \right| dy,
\end{aligned}$$

for some c_3. Now we choose δ small so that $c_2 c_3 |U| N^{-1} \delta t^{-\frac{d+1}{2}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{4}$. The convergence of the second term on the right hand side of the inequality above follows from the uniform continuity of $q^U(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ on $B(x_0, \frac{1}{2}\rho_U(x_0)) \times \{y \in U : \rho_U(y) \geq \delta\}$ (Theorem 3.1 in [14]). Thus we have proved the proposition. $\square$

Recall that, a point z on the boundary ∂U of an open subset U of D is said to be a regular boundary point for $\widehat{X}^D$ in U if $\mathbf{P}_x(\widehat{\tau}^D_U = 0) = 1$. An open subset U of D is said to be regular if every point in ∂U is a regular boundary point.

Proposition 4.5 *Suppose U is an open subset of D with $\overline{U} \subset D$, and $z \in \partial U$. If there is a cone A with vertex z such that $A \cap B(z,r) \subset D \setminus U$ for some $r > 0$, then z is a regular boundary point of U.*

Proof. Choose a bounded smooth domain D_1 with $\overline{U} \subset D_1 \subset \overline{D_1} \subset D$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $z = 0$ and $A \cap B(z,r) \subset D_1 \setminus U$. For $n \geq 1$, put $r_n = r/n$. Under $\mathbf{P}_0$, we have

$$\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \{\widehat{X}^D_{r_n} \in A \cap B(0,r)\} \subset \{\widehat{\tau}^D_U = 0\}.$$

Moreover, since D_1 is bounded smooth and $\overline{D_1} \subset D$, by (1.3) there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such that for $x \in A \cap B(0,r)$ and large n

$$\frac{q^{D_1}(t,x,0) h_D(x)}{h_D(0)} \geq c_1 r_n^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{c_2 |x|^2}{r_n}}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{P}_0(\widehat{\tau}^D_U = 0) \geq \mathbf{P}_0\left(\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} \{\widehat{X}^D_{r_n} \in A \cap B(0,r)\} \right) \geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbf{P}_0(\widehat{X}^D_{r_n} \in A \cap B(0,r)) \\
&\geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbf{P}_0(\widehat{X}^{D_1}_{r_n} \in A \cap B(0,r)) = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \int_{A \cap B(0,r)} \frac{q^{D_1}(t,x,0) h_D(x)}{h_D(0)} dx \\
&\geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} c_1 \int_{A \cap B(0,r)} r_n^{-\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{c_2 |x|^2}{r_n}} dx \geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} c_1 \int_{A \cap B(0,n)} e^{-c_2 |y|^2} dy > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The assertion of the proposition now follows from Blumenthal's zero-one law (Proposition I.5.17 in [3]). □

This result implies that all bounded Lipschitz domains (see below for the definition) are regular if their closures are in D. Modifying the argument in the second part of the proof of Theorem 1.23 in [12], we get the following result.

Proposition 4.6 *Suppose U is an open set subset of D with $\overline{U} \subset D$ and f is a bounded Borel function on ∂U. If z is a regular boundary point of U for $\widehat{X}^D$ and f is continuous at z*

$$\lim_{\overline{U}\ni x\to z} \mathbf{E}_x\left[f\left(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}^D_U}\right);\widehat{\tau}^D_U<\widehat{\zeta}\right]=f(z).$$

Proof. With Lemma 4.3 and Proposition 4.4 in hand, the proof is routine. We omit the details. □

Let G^0_D be the Green function of a Brownian motion W in D. By Theorem 3.7 in [15], there exist constants $r_1 = r_1(d,\mu) > 0$ and $M_1 = M_1(d,\mu) > 1$ depending on μ only via the rate at which $\max_{1\le i\le d} M_{\mu^i}(r)$ goes to zero such that for $r \le r_1$, $z \in \mathbf{R}^d$, $x, y \in B(z,r)$,

$$M_1^{-1}\, G^0_{B(z,r)}(x,y) \le G_{B(z,r)}(y,x) \le M_1\, G^0_{B(z,r)}(x,y). \tag{4.4}$$

We will fix the constants $r_1 > 0$ and $M_1 > 0$ above in the remainder of this section.

Theorem 4.7 *For any bounded domain D, $r \le r_1$, $z \in D$ and $x \in B^z_r := B(z,r) \in \overline{B(z,r)} \subset D$, we have*

$$M_1^{-2}\, h_D(y)\mathbf{P}_x\left(W_{\tau_{B^z_r}}\in dy\right) \le h_D(x)\mathbf{P}_x\left(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}_{B^z_r}}\in dy, \widehat{\tau}_{B^z_r}<\widehat{\zeta}\right) \le M_1^2\, h_D(y)\mathbf{P}_x\left(W_{\tau_{B^z_r}}\in dy\right). \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. We fix $z_0 \in D$ and $r \le r_1$ with $B(z_0,r) \in \overline{B(z_0,r)} \subset D$, and let $B := B(z_0,r)$. The idea of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 2.2 in [9]. We include the detail here for the reader's convenience. Let $\varphi \ge 0$ is a continuous function on ∂B and let

$$u(x) := \mathbf{E}_x[\varphi(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}^D_B}); \widehat{\tau}^D_B < \widehat{\zeta}].$$

By Proposition 4.6, we know that u is harmonic for $\widehat{X}^D$ in B and continuous on $\overline{B}$. Let $B(n) := B(z_0, (1-\frac{1}{n})r)$, $T_n := \inf\{t > 0 : \widehat{X}^D_t \in B(n)\}$ and $u_n(x) := \mathbf{E}_x[u(\widehat{X}^{D,B}_{T_n})]$. Then by Proposition 4.2, there exist Radon measures ν_n supported on $\partial B(n)$ such that

$$u_n(x) = \frac{1}{h_D(x)}\int_{\partial B(n)} G_B(y,x)\nu_n(dy).$$

Let

$$v_n(x) := \int_{\partial B(n)} G^0_B(x,y)\nu_n(dy).$$

Then by (4.4),

$$M_1^{-1}v_n(x) \le h_D(x)u_n(x) \le M_1 v_n(x), \qquad x \in B(n).$$

Since v_n is a harmonic function in $B(m)$ for $m \ge n$, by the Hölder continuity of v_n and a diagonalization procedure, there is a subsequence n_k such that v_{n_k} converges uniformly on each $B(m)$ to a harmonic function v in B. Thus

$$M_1^{-1}v(x) \le h_D(x)u(x) \le M_1 v(x), \qquad x \in B. \tag{4.6}$$

Since B is regular for $\widehat{X}^D$ (Proposition 4.5), by taking the limit above and using Proposition 4.6, we get for every $w \in \partial B$

$$M_1^{-1}h_D(w)\varphi(w) \le \liminf_{B\ni x\to w} v(x) \le \limsup_{B\ni x\to w} v(x) \le M_1 h_D(w)\varphi(w). \tag{4.7}$$

Let

$$w(x) = \mathbf{E}_x\left[h_D(W_{\tau_B})\varphi(W_{\tau_B})\right].$$

w is a harmonic function in B and continuous in $\overline{B}$ with the boundary value $h_D(w)\varphi(w)$. Thus by the maximum principle and (4.7), we get $M_1^{-1}w(x) \le v(x) \le M_1 w(x)$. So by (4.6) $M_1^{-2}w(x) \le h_D(x)u(x) \le M_1^2 w(x)$, which is

$$\begin{aligned} M_1^{-2}\int_{\partial B}\varphi(w)h_D(w)\mathbf{P}_x\left(W_{\tau_B}\in dw\right) &\le \int_{\partial B}\varphi(w)h_D(x)\mathbf{P}_x\left(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}^D_B}\in dw, \widehat{\tau}^D_B < \widehat{\zeta}\right) \\ &\le M_1^2\int_{\partial B}\varphi(w)h_D(w)\mathbf{P}_x\left(W_{\tau_B}\in dw\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Let $\rho_D(x)$ be the distance between x and ∂D.

Lemma 4.8 *Suppose D is a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain. Then there exists a constant $c = c(D)$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{c}\rho_D(x) \le h_D(x) \le c\rho_D(x). \tag{4.8}$$

Proof. Since D is bounded, the Green function estimates for X^D ((6.2)-(6.3) in [14]) imply that

$$c_1\rho_D(x)(1\wedge\frac{\rho_D(y)}{|x-y|^2})\frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-2}} \le G_D(y,x) \le c_2\frac{\rho_D(x)}{|x-y|^{d-1}}$$

for some positive constants c_1 and c_2. Integrating over y we get

$$c_1\rho_D(x)q_1(x) \le h_D(x) \le c_2\rho_D(x)q_2(x)$$

where

$$q_1(x) := \int_D (1 \wedge \frac{\rho_D(y)}{|x-y|^2}) \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-2}} dy \quad \text{and} \quad q_2(x) := \int_D \frac{1}{|x-y|^{d-1}} dy.$$

By elementary calculus, we easily see that $\inf_{x \in D} q_1(x) > 0$ and $\sup_{x \in D} q_2(x) < \infty$. $\Box$

Let ψ_0 be the ground state for the killed Brownian motion in D, that is, ψ_0 is the positive eigenfunction corresponding to the smallest eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian $-\frac{1}{2}\Delta|_D$ with $\int_D \psi_0^2(dx)dx = 1$. If D is bounded $C^{1,1}$, it is well-known that there exists c_1 such that $c_1^{-1}\rho_D(x) \le \psi_0(x) \le c_1 \rho_D(x)$. So we get the next result as a corollary of Theorem 4.7 and Lemma 4.8.

Corollary 4.9 *For any bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain D, there exists a positive constant c such that for every $r \le r_1$, $z \in D$ and $x \in B_r^z := B(z,r) \in \overline{B(z,r)} \subset D$, we have*

$$c^{-1}\, \mathbf{P}_x \left(W^{\psi_0}_{\tau_{B_r^z}} \in dy \right) \le \mathbf{P}_x \left(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}_{B_r^z}} \in dy, \widehat{\tau}_{B_r^z} < \widehat{\zeta} \right) \le c\, \mathbf{P}_x \left(W^{\psi_0}_{\tau_{B_r^z}} \in dy \right) \tag{4.9}$$

where W^{ψ_0} is the h-conditioned Brownian motion with $h = \psi_0$.

In the remainder of this section, we will prove a scale invariant Harnack inequality for $\widehat{X}^D$ for any bounded domain D. First we prove the following lemma. Recall that $r_1 > 0$ and $M_1 > 0$ are the constants from (4.4).

Lemma 4.10 *There exists a constant $c = c(D, \mu) > 1$ such that for every $r < r_1$ and $B(z,r)$ with $B(z,r) \subset D$,*

$$\frac{h_D(x)}{h_D(y)} \le c, \quad x, y \in B(z, \frac{r}{2}).$$

Proof. Since $r < r_1$, by (2.2) and (4.4), there exists $c_1 = c_1(D, \mu) > 1$ such that for every $x, w \in \overline{B(z, \frac{3r}{4})}$

$$c_1^{-1} \frac{1}{|w-x|^{d-2}} \le M_1^{-1}\, G^0_{B(z,r)}(w,x) \le G_{B(z,r)}(w,x) \le G_D(w,x) \le c_1 \frac{1}{|w-x|^{d-2}}.$$

Thus for $w \in \partial B(z, \frac{3r}{4})$ and $x, y \in B(z, \frac{r}{2})$, we have

$$G_D(w,x) \le c_1 \left(\frac{|w-y|}{|w-x|} \right)^{d-2} \frac{1}{|w-y|^{d-2}} \le 4^{d-2}\, c_1^2\, G_D(w,y). \tag{4.10}$$

On the other hand, from (2.4), we have

$$h_D(x) = \int_D G_D(a,x)da = \int_D \mathbf{E}_a \left[G_D(X_{T_{B(z,\frac{3r}{4})}}, x) \right] da, \quad x \in B(z, \frac{3r}{4}). \tag{4.11}$$

Since $X_{T_{B(z,\frac{3r}{4})}} \in \partial B(z, \frac{3r}{4})$, combining (4.10)-(4.11), we get

$$h_D(x) \le 4^{d-2}\, c_1^2 \int_D \mathbf{E}_a \left[G_D(X_{T_{B(z,\frac{3r}{4})}}, y) \right] da = 4^{d-2}\, c_1^2\, h_D(y), \quad x, y \in B(z, \frac{r}{2})$$

□

Now we are ready to prove the scale invariant Harnack inequality.

Theorem 4.11 *(Scale invariant Harnack inequality) There exists* $N = N(d, \mu) > 0$ *such that for every harmonic function* f *of* $\widehat{X}^D$ *in* $B(z_0, r)$ *with* $r \in (0, r_1]$ *and* $B(z_0, r) \subset D$*, we have*

$$\sup_{y \in B(z_0, r/4)} f(y) \le N \inf_{y \in B(z_0, r/4)} f(y)$$

Proof. We fix $z_0 \in D$ and $r \le r_1$ with $B(z_0, r) \in B(z_0, r) \subset D$, and a harmonic function f of $\widehat{X}^D$ in $B(z_0, r)$. By the harmonicity of f and Theorem 4.7, for every $x \in B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})$

$$f(x) \,=\, \mathbf{E}_x \left[f\left(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}_{B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})}} \right); \widehat{\tau}_{B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})} < \widehat{\zeta} \right] \,\le\, \frac{M_1^2}{h_D(x)} \mathbf{E}_x \left[h_D\left(W_{\tau_{B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})}} \right) f\left(W_{\tau_{B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})}} \right) \right],$$

Thus by Lemma 4.10,

$$f(x) \,\le\, c\, M_1^2\, \mathbf{E}_x \left[f\left(W_{\tau_{B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})}} \right) \right] \,=:\, c\, M_1^2\, g(x)$$

for some constant c. Since g is harmonic for W in $B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})$, by the Harnack inequality for Brownian motion (for example, see [1]),

$$\frac{1}{c_1} g(y) \,\le\, g(x) \,\le\, c_1 g(y), \quad x, y \in B(z_0, \frac{r}{4})$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$. Thus by applying Theorem 4.7 and Lemma 4.10 again, we have that for every $x, y \in B(z_0, \frac{r}{4})$,

$$f(x) \,\le\, c\, c_1\, M_1^2 \mathbf{E}_y \left[f\left(W_{\tau_{B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})}} \right) \right] \,\le\, c^2\, c_1\, M_1^4 \mathbf{E}_x \left[f\left(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}_{B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})}} \right); \widehat{\tau}_{B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})} < \widehat{\zeta} \right] \,=\, c^2\, c_1\, M_1^4\, f(y).$$

□

It is well-known that the scale invariant Harnack inequality implies the Hölder continuity of harmonic function (for example, see section 2.3.2 of [27]).

Corollary 4.12 *Every harmonic function for* $\widehat{X}^D$ *is Hölder continuous.*

5 Martin representation in arbitrary bounded domains

In this section we assume that D is an arbitrary bounded domain. From Proposition 2.1, Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.4, we see that both $\widehat{X}^D$ and X^D satisfy the conditions (a)-(e) on page 560-561 in [7]. Thus by Theorem 3 in [19] we can define the Martin boundary for $\widehat{X}^D$. In fact, we have a stronger result. We will state here for $\widehat{X}^D$ and X^D simultaneously. From now on, we fix a point $x_0 \in D$ throughout this paper.

Define

$$M_D(x,y) := \begin{cases} \frac{\overline{G}_D(x,y)}{\overline{G}_D(x_0,y)} = \frac{G_D(x,y)}{G_D(x_0,y)} & \text{if } x \in D \text{ and } y \in D \setminus \{x_0\} \\ 1_{\{x_0\}}(x) & \text{if } y = x_0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\widehat{M}_D(x,y) := \begin{cases} \frac{\overline{G}_D(y,x)}{\overline{G}_D(y,x_0)} = \frac{h_D(x)G_D(x,y)}{h_D(x_0)G_D(x_0,y)} & \text{if } x \in D \text{ and } y \in D \setminus \{x_0\} \\ 1_{\{x_0\}}(x) & \text{if } y = x_0 \end{cases}$$

By (A4) and (A6), we know that for each $y \in D \setminus \{x_0\}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, $M_D(\,\cdot\,,y)$ ($\widehat{M}_D(\,\cdot\,,y)$ respectively) is a harmonic function with respect to X^D ($\widehat{X}^D$ respectively) in $D \setminus B(y,\varepsilon)$ and for every $x \in D \setminus B(y,\varepsilon)$

$$M_D(x,y) = \mathbf{E}_x\left[M_D(X^D_{\tau_{D\setminus B(y,\varepsilon)}},y)\right] \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{M}_D(x,y) = \mathbf{E}_x\left[\widehat{M}_D(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}_{D\setminus B(y,\varepsilon)}},y); \widehat{\tau}_{D\setminus B(y,\varepsilon)} < \widehat{\zeta}\right]. \tag{5.1}$$

Using the Riesz decomposition theorem (Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 3.2), Proposition 2.6 (with $U = D$), the Harnack inequality (Corollary 5.8 in [14] and Theorem 4.11) and the Hölder continuity of harmonic functions (Theorem 5.5 in [14] and Corollary 4.12), one can follow the arguments in [23] (see also Section 2.7 of [1] or [29]) to show that the process X^D ($\widehat{X}^D$ respectively) has a Martin boundary $\partial_M D$ ($\widehat{\partial}_M D$ respectively) satisfying the following properties.

(M1) $D \cup \partial_M D$ and $D \cup \widehat{\partial}_M D$ are compact metric spaces;

(M2) D is open and dense in $D \cup \partial_M D$ and in $D \cup \widehat{\partial}_M D$ and its relative topology coincides with its original topology;

(M3) $M_D(x,\,\cdot\,)$ can be extended to ∂_M uniquely in such a way that, $M_D(x,y)$ converges to $M_D(x,w)$ as $y \to w \in \partial_M D$, the function $M_D(x,w)$ is jointly continuous on $D \times \partial_M D$, and $M_D(\cdot,w_1) \neq M_D(\cdot,w_2)$ if $w_1 \neq w_2$;

(M4) $\widehat{M}_D(x,\,\cdot\,)$ can be extended to $\widehat{\partial}_M$ uniquely in such a way that, $\widehat{M}_D(x,y)$ converges to $\widehat{M}_D(x,w)$ as $y \to w \in \widehat{\partial}_M D$, the function $\widehat{M}_D(x,w)$ is jointly continuous on $D \times \widehat{\partial}_M D$, and $\widehat{M}_D(\cdot,w_1) \neq \widehat{M}_D(\cdot,w_2)$ if $w_1 \neq w_2$;

By repeating the argument in the proof of Proposition 5.1 in [15], we have the following.

Proposition 5.1 *For every $w \in \partial_M D$ ($w \in \widehat{\partial}_M D$ respectively), $x \mapsto M_D(x,w)$ ($x \mapsto \widehat{M}_D(x,w)$ respectively) is harmonic with respect to X^D ($\widehat{X}^D$ respectively).*

Proof. We include the proof here for $\widehat{X}^D$ for the reader's convenience. Fix $w \in \partial_M D$ and a relatively compact open sets $U \subset \overline{U} \subset U_1 \subset \overline{U_1}$ in D. Let $\delta := \frac{1}{2}\text{dist}(U, \partial U_1)$. Choose a sequence $\{y_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ in $D \setminus \overline{U_1}$ converging to w in $D \cup \partial_M D$ so that

$$\widehat{M}_D(x,w) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \widehat{M}_D(x,y_n).$$

Since $\widehat{M}_D(\,\cdot\,, y_n)$ is harmonic in a neighborhood of U for every $n \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}_x\left[\widehat{M}_D(\widehat{X}^D_{\tau_U}, y_n)\right] \,=\, \widehat{M}_D(x, y_n), \quad x \in U.$$

Using the Harnack inequality (Theorem 4.11), we have for every $z \in \partial U$,

$$\widehat{M}_D(z, y_n) = \frac{\overline{G}_D(y_n, z)}{\overline{G}_D(y_n, x_0)} \,\leq\, c_1 \frac{\overline{G}_D(y_n, x_0)}{\overline{G}_D(y_n, x_0)} \,=\, c_1, \qquad n \geq 1,$$

for some $c_1 = c_1(\delta, D) > 0$. Thus by the bounded convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{E}_x\left[\widehat{M}_D(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}_U}; y_n); \widehat{\tau}_U < \widehat{\zeta}\right] \,=\, \mathbf{E}_x\left[\widehat{M}_D(\widehat{X}^D_{\widehat{\tau}_U}, w); \widehat{\tau}_U < \widehat{\zeta}\right] \,=\, \widehat{M}_D(x, w), \quad x \in U.$$

□

Recall that a positive harmonic function u with respect to X^D ($\widehat{X}^D$ respectively) is said to be minimal if v is positive harmonic with respect to X^D ($\widehat{X}^D$ respectively) and $v \leq u$ imply that v is a constant multiple of u. The minimal Martin boundaries of X^D and $\widehat{X}^D$ are defined as

$$\partial_m D = \{z \in \partial_M D : M_D(\cdot, z) \text{ is minimal harmonic with respect to } X^D\ \}$$

and

$$\widehat{\partial}_m D = \{z \in \widehat{\partial}_M D : \widehat{M}_D(\cdot, z) \text{ is minimal harmonic with respect to } \widehat{X}^D\ \}$$

respectively. Since $M_D(x_0, y) = 1$ for every $y \in (D \cup \partial_M D) \setminus \{x_0\}$, using the Harnack inequality and the Hölder continuity of harmonic functions, we can show that, for any compact subset K of D, the family $\{M_D(\cdot, w) : w \in \partial_M D\}$ and $\{\widehat{M}_D(\cdot, w) : w \in \partial_M D\}$ are uniformly bounded and equicontinuous on K. One can then apply the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem to prove that, for every excessive function f of X^D, there exist a unique Radon measure ν_1 on D and a unique finite measure ν_2 on $\partial_m D$ such that

$$f(x) = \int_D G_D(x, y)\nu_1(dy) + \int_{\partial_m D} M_D(x, z)\nu_2(dz), \tag{5.2}$$

and f is harmonic in D with respect to X if and only if $\nu_1 = 0$. Similarly, for every excessive function f of $\widehat{X}^D$, there exist a unique Radon measure μ_1 on D and a unique finite measure μ_2 on $\widehat{\partial}_m D$ such that

$$f(x) = \int_D \overline{G}_D(y, x)\mu_1(dy) + \int_{\widehat{\partial}_m D} \widehat{M}_D(x, z)\mu_2(dz), \tag{5.3}$$

and f is harmonic with respect to $\widehat{X}^D$ if and only if $\mu_1 = 0$. (See Section 2.7 of [1])

6 Martin boundary and Boundary Harnack principle for $\widehat{X}^D$

In this section, we will, under some assumption on the domain, identify the Martin boundary of the dual process with the Euclidean boundary and prove a boundary Harnack principle for the dual process.

Recall that a bounded domain D is said to be Lipschitz if there is a localization radius $r_0 > 0$ and a constant $\Lambda > 0$ such that for every $Q \in \partial D$, there is a Lipschitz function $\phi_Q : \mathbf{R}^{d-1} \to \mathbf{R}$ satisfying $|\phi_Q(x) - \phi_Q(z)| \le \Lambda |x - z|$, and an orthonormal coordinate system CS_Q with origin at Q such that

$$B(Q, r_0) \cap D = B(Q, r_0) \cap \{y = (y_1, \cdots, y_{d-1}, y_d) =: (\tilde{y}, y_d) \text{ in } CS_Q : y_d > \phi_Q(\tilde{y})\}.$$

The pair (r_0, Λ) is called the characteristics of the Lipschitz domain D.

We first recall the scale invariant boundary Harnack principle for X^D in bounded Lipschitz domains from [15].

Theorem 6.1 *(Theorem 4.6 in [15]) Suppose D is a bounded Lipschitz domain. Then there exist constants $M_2, c > 1$ and $r_2 > 0$, depending on μ only via the rate at which* $\max_{1\le i\le d}$ *goes to zero such that for every $Q \in \partial D$, $r < r_2$ and any nonnegative functions u and v which are harmonic with respect to X^D in $D \cap B(Q, M_2 r)$ and vanish continuously on $\partial D \cap B(Q, M_2 r)$, we have*

$$\frac{u(x)}{v(x)} \le c\, \frac{u(y)}{v(y)} \qquad \textit{for any } x, y \in D \cap B(Q, r). \tag{6.1}$$

It is well-known that for diffusions, the scale-invariant boundary Harnack principle can be used to prove the Hölder continuity of the ratio of two harmonic functions vanishing continuously near the boundary. We omit the proof of the next lemma. The proof can be found in [1] (see [4] for the extension to jump processes).

Lemma 6.2 *Suppose D is a bounded Lipschitz domain. Then there exist positive constants r_2, M_2, C and a depending on D such that for any $Q \in \partial D$, $r < r_2$ and nonnegative functions u, v which are harmonic with respect to X^D in $D \cap B(Q, M_2 r)$ and vanish continuously on $\partial D \cap B(Q, M_2 r)$, the limit* $\lim_{D \ni x \to w} u(x)/v(x)$ *exists for every $w \in \partial D \cap B(Q, r)$.*

In this section we consider two bounded domains U and D with $U \subset D$. We will not exclude the case $U = D$. Let $x_U \in U$ (if $U = D$, $x_U = x_0$) and define

$$\widehat{M}_{D,U}(x, y) := \begin{cases} \frac{h_D(x_U) G_U(y,x)}{h_D(x) G_U(y,x_U)} & \text{if } x \in U \text{ and } y \in U \setminus \{x_U\} \\ 1_{\{x_U\}}(x) & \text{if } y = x_U \end{cases}$$

Note that $\widehat{M}_{D,U}(x, y) = \widehat{M}_D(x, y)$ if $D = U$. Similar to the proof of Proposition 4.4, one can show that $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$ (with X^U as a dual process) satisfies the conditions (a)-(e) on page 560-561 in [7]. Thus by Theorem 3 in [19], we can define the Martin boundary $\widehat{\partial}_M U$ for the process $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$. Moreover, one can prove that for every $w \in \widehat{\partial}_M D$, $x \mapsto \widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,w)$ is harmonic with respect to $\widehat{X}^D$ in U using an argument similar to that of the proof of Proposition 5.1. Let $\widehat{\partial}_m U$ be the minimal Martin boundary of $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$. We also have the Martin representation: for every harmonic function f of $\widehat{X}^D$ in U, there is a unique finite measure μ_1 on $\widehat{\partial}_m U$ such that

$$f(x) = \int_{\widehat{\partial}_m U} \widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,z)\mu_1(dz). \tag{6.2}$$

Suppose U is a bounded Lipschitz domain. We observe that for $y \neq x_U$,

$$\widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,y) \;=\; \frac{h_D(x_U)G_U(y,x)}{h_D(x)G_U(y,x_U)}. \tag{6.3}$$

$G_U(\,\cdot\,,x)$ and $G_U(\,\cdot\,,x_U)$ are harmonic with respect to X^U near the boundary. Moreover they vanish continuously on the boundary by Theorem 2.6 in [15]. Thus from Lemma 6.2, we immediately get the following

Proposition 6.3 *Suppose U is a bounded Lipschitz domain. Then $\widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,y)$ converges as $y \to w \in \partial U$.*

The proposition above says that the Martin boundary is a subset of ∂U. We write the limit above as $\widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,w)$ for $(x,w) \in U \times \partial U$. Let $N_U(x,w) := \lim_{U \ni y \to w} \frac{G_U(y,x)}{G_U(y,x_U)}$ so that

$$\widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,w) = \frac{h_D(x_U)N_U(x,w)}{h_D(x)}.$$

We will show that the (minimal) Martin boundary $\widehat{\partial}_m U$ with respect to $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$ coincides with the Euclidean boundary if D and U are bounded $C^{1,1}$. Let $\rho_U(x)$ be the distance between x and ∂U.

Theorem 6.4 *Suppose D and U are bounded $C^{1,1}$ domains with $U \subset D$. Then there exists a constant $c = c(D,U)$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{c}\frac{\rho_U(x)}{|x-w|^d} \;\le\; \widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,w) \;\le\; c\,\frac{1}{|x-w|^d} \tag{6.4}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{c}\frac{1}{|x-w|^d} \;\le\; \widehat{M}_D(x,w) \;\le\; c\,\frac{1}{|x-w|^d} \tag{6.5}$$

Proof. By the Green function estimates for X^U (Theorem 6.2 in [14]), we have

$$c_1\,\frac{\rho_U(x)}{|x-w|^d} \;\le\; N_U(x,w) \;\le\; c_1\,\frac{\rho_U(x)}{|x-w|^d}$$

for some positive constants c_1 and c_2. Thus by (4.8) and the fact that $\rho_U(x) \le \rho(x) \le \mathrm{diam}(D)$

$$\frac{1}{c}\,\frac{h_D(x_U)\rho_U(x)}{|x-w|^d} \;\le\; \widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,w) \;\le\; c\,\frac{h_D(x_U)}{|x-w|^d}.$$

$\square$

The above implies

Proposition 6.5 *If D and U are bounded $C^{1,1}$ domains with $U \subset D$, $\widehat{M}_{D,U}(\,\cdot\,,w_1) \neq \widehat{M}_{D,U}(\,\cdot\,,w_2)$ if $w_1 \neq w_2$.*

Moreover, one can follow the argument in the proof of Theorem 4.4 [6] and show that $\widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,w)$ is minimal harmonic. Thus the minimal Martin boundary of $\widehat{X}^{D,U}$ is the same as the Euclidean boundary in the case when D and U are bounded $C^{1,1}$ domains with $U \subset D$.

Theorem 6.6 *Assume that either D and U are bounded $C^{1,1}$ domains with $U \subset D$ or U is bounded Lipschitz domain with $\overline{U} \subset D$. Then for every harmonic function f of $\widehat{X}^D$ in U, there is a unique finite measure μ_1 on ∂U such that*

$$f(x) = \int_{\partial U} \widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,z)\mu_1(dz), \tag{6.6}$$

∂D.

Proof. The case when D and U are bounded $C^{1,1}$ domains with $U \subset D$ has already been dealt with in the paragraph before the theorem. In the case when U is bounded Lipschitz domain with $\overline{U} \subset D$, $\widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,z)$ is comparable to $N_U(x,z)$. One can easily modify the argument in page 193-194 of [1] to prove the theorem. We omit the details. $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the boundary Harnack principle for $\widehat{X}^D$. If D is a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain, then it is easy to check that there exists $R > 0$ such that for any $x \in \partial D$ and $r \in (0,R)$, $B(x,r) \cap D$ is connected.

Theorem 6.7 *(Boundary Harnack principle) Suppose D be a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain in $\mathbf{R}^d$ and R is the constant above. Then for any $r \in (0,R)$ and $z_0 \in \partial D$, there exists a constant $c > 1$ such that for any nonnegative harmonic functions u, v in $D \cap B(z_0,r)$ with respect to $\widehat{X}^D$ with uh_D and vh_D vanishing continuously on $\partial D \cap B(z_0,r)$, we have*

$$\frac{u(x)}{v(x)} \le c\,\frac{u(y)}{v(y)} \qquad \text{for any } x, y \in D \cap B(z_0, r/2).$$

Proof. One can find a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain U such that $D \cap B(z_0, 2r/3) \subset U \subset \overline{U} \subset D \cap B(z_0, r)$. Fix $x_U \in U$ and let

$$M_2(x,z) := \widehat{M}_{D,U}(x,z) = \lim_{U \ni y \to z} \frac{h_D(x_U) G_U(y,x)}{h_D(x) G_U(y, x_U)}.$$

Since u, v are harmonic in U with respect to $\widehat{X}^D$, by Theorem 6.6, there exist finite measures μ_1 and ν_1 on ∂U such that

$$u(x) = \int_{\partial U} M_2(x,z)\mu_1(dz) \quad \text{and} \quad v(x) = \int_{\partial U} M_2(x,z)\nu_1(dz), \quad x \in U.$$

Let $N_2(x,z) := \lim_{U \ni y \to z} \frac{G_U(y,x)}{G_U(y,x_U)}$ so that

$$M_2(x,z) = \frac{h_D(x_U) N_2(x,z)}{h_D(x)}.$$

Let G_U^0 be the Green function of the Brownian motion W in U. Define the Martin kernel $M_1(x,z)$ for the Brownian motion W in U:

$$M_1(x,z) := \lim_{U \ni y \to z} \frac{G_U^0(x,y)}{G_U^0(x_U,y)}.$$

Since U is bounded $C^{1,1}$, by Theorem 7.7 in [14], there exists a constant $c_1 = c_1(x_U, U)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_1} M_1(x,z) \le N_2(x,z) \le c_1 M_1(x,z). \tag{6.7}$$

Let

$$u_1(x) := \int_{\partial U} M_1(x,z)\mu_1(dz) \quad \text{and} \quad v_1(x) := \int_{\partial U} M_1(x,z)\nu_1(dz), \quad x \in U.$$

By (6.7), we have for every $x \in U$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{u(x)}{v(x)} &= \frac{\int_{\partial U} M_2(x,z)\mu_1(dz)}{\int_{\partial U} M_2(x,z)\nu_1(dz)} = \frac{\int_{\partial U} N_2(x,z)\mu_1(dz)}{\int_{\partial U} N_2(x,z)\nu_1(dz)} \\ &\le c_1^2 \frac{\int_{\partial U} M_1(x,z)\mu_1(dz)}{\int_{\partial U} M_1(x,z)\nu_1(dz)} = c_1^2 \frac{u_1(x)}{v_1(x)} \le c_1^4 \frac{u(x)}{v(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since u_1, v_1 are harmonic for the Brownian motion W in U and vanish continuously on $\partial U \cap \partial D$, by the boundary Harnack principle for Brownian motion (for example, see [1]),

$$\frac{u_1(x)}{v_1(x)} \le c_2 \frac{u_1(y)}{v_1(y)}, \quad x, y \in D \cap B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})$$

for some constant $c_2 > 0$. Thus for every $x, y \in D \cap B(z_0, \frac{r}{2})$

$$\frac{u(x)}{v(x)} \le c_1^2 \frac{u_1(x)}{v_1(x)} \le c_2 c_1^2 \frac{u_1(y)}{v_1(y)} \le c_2 c_1^4 \frac{u(y)}{v(y)}.$$

□

7 Schrödinger operator in arbitrary bounded domains

In this section we discuss the Schrödinger operator in arbitrary bounded domains. Using results in the previous sections, one can check that X^D and $\widehat{X}^D$ satisfy the condition (a)-(f) and (6.1) in [7] with the reference measure ξ_D. Thus the main results in [7] are true for X^D and $\widehat{X}^D$ with the reference measure ξ_D. In this section we will use the main results in [7] and state carefully for X^D with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Recall that a measure ν on D is said to be a smooth measure of X^D with respect to the reference measure ξ_D if there is a positive continuous additive functional (PCAF in abbreviation) A of X^D such that for all bounded nonnegative function f on D,

$$\int_D f(x)\nu(dx) = \lim_{t\downarrow 0} \mathbf{E}_{\xi_D}\left[\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t f(X_s^D)dA_s\right]. \tag{7.1}$$

The additive functional A is called the positive continuous additive functional of X^D with Revuz measure ν with the reference measure ξ_D. It is known (see [26]) that for any $x \in D$, $\alpha \geq 0$ and bounded nonnegative function f on D,

$$\mathbf{E}_x \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} f(X_t^D)dA_t = \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t}\int_D \overline{q}^D(t,x,y)f(y)\nu(dy)dt,$$

and thus we have any $x \in D$, $t > 0$ and bounded nonnegative function f on D,

$$\mathbf{E}_x \int_0^t f(X_s^D)dA_s = \int_0^t \int_D \overline{q}^D(s,x,y)f(y)\nu(dy)ds.$$

Therefore by the monotone convergence theorem we have any $x \in D$, $t > 0$ and nonnegative function f on D,

$$\mathbf{E}_x \int_0^t f(X_s^D)dA_s = \int_0^t \int_D \overline{q}^D(s,x,y)f(y)\nu(dy)ds. \tag{7.2}$$

For a signed measure ν, we use ν^+ and ν^- to denote its positive and negative parts respectively. If ν^+ and ν^- are smooth measures of X^D with respect to the reference measure ξ_D and A^+ and A^- are PCAFs of X^D with Revuz measures ν^+ and ν^- respectively with respect to the reference measure ξ_D, then we call $A := A^+ - A^-$ of X^D the continuous additive functional of X^D with (signed) Revuz measure ν with respect to the reference measure ξ_D.

A measure η on D is said to be a smooth measure of X^D with respect to the Lebesgue measure if $h_D\eta$ is a smooth measure of X^D with respect to the reference measure ξ_D. From now on, whenever we speak of a smooth measure of X^D, we mean a smooth measure of X^D with respect to the Lebesgue measure unless explicitly mentioned otherwise. If η is a smooth measure of X^D and A is the PCAF of X^D with Revuz measure $h_D\eta$ with respect to the reference measure ξ_D, then by (7.2), we have any $x \in D$, $t > 0$ and bounded nonnegative function f on D,

$$\mathbf{E}_x \int_0^t f(X_s^D)dA_s = \int_0^t \int_D q^D(s,x,y)f(y)\eta(dy)ds. \tag{7.3}$$

The additive functional A in the equation above is called the PCAF of X^D with Revuz measure η with respect to the Lebesgue measure. From now on, whenever we speak of an additive functional with a given Revuz measure, we mean an additive functional with a given Revuz measure with respect to the Lebesgue measure unless explicitly mentioned otherwise.

Recall $\mathbf{K}_{d,2}$ from the Definition 1.1.

Proposition 7.1 *Any measure ν in $\mathbf{K}_{d,2}$ is a smooth measure of X^D with respect to the Lebesgue measure, or equivalently, $h_D\nu$ is a smooth measure of X^D with respect to ξ_D.*

Proof. By the definition of $\mathbf{K}_{d,2}$ we can easily check that the function

$$\overline{G}_D(h_D\nu)(x) = G_D\nu(x)$$

is bounded continuous in D. Thus, by Definition IV.3.2 of [3], $\overline{G}_D(h_D\nu)$ is a regular potential. Moreover X^D and $\widehat{X}^D$ are Hunt processes with the strong Feller property and they are in the strong duality with respect to ξ_D (Propositions 3.1 and 3.4). Consequently $h_D\nu$ charges no semi-polar set by Theorem VI.3.5 of [3]. Now we can apply Theorem VI.1 of [26] to conclude that $h_D\nu$ is a smooth measure of X^D with respect to ξ_D, or equivalently, ν is a smooth measure of X^D with respect to the Lebesgue measure. □

If ν is a signed measure on D such that ν^+ and ν^- are smooth measures of X^D and if A^+ and A^- are the PCAF of X^D with Revuz measures ν^+ and ν^- respectively, we call $A := A^+ - A^-$ of X^D the continuous additive functional of X^D with (signed) Revuz measure ν.

We recall the definitions of the class of measures from [5] and [8] and specify it for X^D with the reference measure ξ_D in an bounded domain D. We also give a definition for a class of smooth measures with respect to the Lebesgue measure. In the following, d denotes the diagonal of $D \times D$.

Definition 7.2 *Let ν be a signed smooth measure of X^D with respect to ξ_D and define $|\nu| := \nu^+ + \nu^-$. ν is said to be in the class $\mathbf{S}_\infty^{\xi_D}(X^D)$ if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a Borel subset $K = K(\varepsilon)$ of finite $|\nu|$-measure and a constant $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for all $(x,z) \in (D \times D) \setminus d$,*

$$\int_{D\setminus K} \frac{\overline{G}_D(x,y)\overline{G}_D(y,z)}{\overline{G}_D(x,z)}\,|\nu|(dy) = \int_{D\setminus K} \frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(y,z)}{G_D(x,z)}\,\frac{|\nu|(dy)}{h_D(y)} \le \varepsilon \tag{7.4}$$

and for all measurable set $B \subset K$ with $|\nu|(B) < \delta$ all $(x,z) \in (D \times D) \setminus d$,

$$\int_{B} \frac{\overline{G}_D(x,y)\overline{G}_D(y,z)}{\overline{G}_D(x,z)}\,|\nu|(dy) = \int_{B} \frac{G_D(x,y)G_D(y,z)}{G_D(x,z)}\,\frac{|\nu|(dy)}{h_D(y)} \le \varepsilon. \tag{7.5}$$

A function q is said to be in the class $\mathbf{S}_\infty^{\xi_D}(X^D)$ if $\nu(dx) := q(x)\xi_D(dx)$ is in the corresponding space.

A signed smooth ν of X^D is said to be in the class $\mathbf{S}_\infty(X^D)$ if $h_D(x)\nu(dx)$ is in the class $\mathbf{S}_\infty^{\xi_D}(X^D)$.

For a continuous additive functional A of X^D with Revuz measure ν, we define $e_A(t) = \exp(A_t)$, for $t \geq 0$. For $y \in D$, let $X^{D,y}$ denote the h-conditioned process obtained from X^D with $h(\cdot) = G_D(\cdot, y)$ and let $\mathbf{E}_x^y$ denote the expectation for $X^{D,y}$ starting from $x \in D$. We will use τ_D^y to denote the lifetime of the process $X^{D,y}$.

In the remainder of this section, we assume that $\nu \in \mathbf{S}_\infty(X^D)$ and A is the CAF of X^D with Revuz measure ν (with respect to the Lebesgue measure). Note that A is also the CAF of X^D with Revuz measure $h_D(x)\nu(dx)$ with respect to the reference measure ξ_D.

The CAF A gives rise to a Schrödinger semigroup

$$Q_t^D f(x) := \mathbf{E}_x \left[e_A(t) f(X_t^D) \right].$$

The function $x \mapsto \mathbf{E}_x[e_A(\tau_D)]$ is called the gauge function of ν. We say ν is *gaugeable* if $\mathbf{E}_x[e_A(\tau_D)]$ is finite for some $x \in D$. From now on we will assume that ν is gaugeable. It follows from [5] and [8] that the gauge function $x \mapsto \mathbf{E}_x[e_A(\tau_D)]$ is bounded on D. Note that since $h_D(x)\nu(dx) \in \mathbf{S}_\infty^{\xi_D}(X^D)$, it follows again from [5] and [8] that

$$\sup_{(x,y)\in(D\times D)\setminus d} \mathbf{E}_x^y \left[|A|_{\tau_D^y} \right] < \infty$$

(see [5]) and therefore by Jensen's inequality

$$\inf_{(x,y)\in(D\times D)\setminus d} \mathbf{E}_x^y [e_A(\tau_D^y)] > 0. \tag{7.6}$$

By Lemma 3.5 of [5], the Green function for the Schrödinger semigroup $\{Q_t^D,\, t \geq 0\}$ with respect to ξ_D is

$$\overline{V}_D(x,y) = \mathbf{E}_x^y \left[e_A(\tau_D^y) \right] \overline{G}_D(x,y), \tag{7.7}$$

that is,

$$\int_D \overline{V}_D(x,y) f(y)\, \xi_D(dy) = \int_0^\infty Q_t^D f(x)\, dt = \mathbf{E}_x \left[\int_0^\infty e_A(t) f(X_t^D)\, dt \right] \tag{7.8}$$

for any Borel function $f \geq 0$ on D. Let

$$V_D(x,y) := \overline{V}_D(x,y) h_D(y)$$

so that

$$\int_D V_D(x,y) f(y)\, dy = \int_0^\infty Q_t^D f(x)\, dt = \mathbf{E}_x \left[\int_0^\infty e_A(t) f(X_t^D)\, dt \right] \tag{7.9}$$

Thus $V_D(x,y)$ is the Green function for the Schrödinger semigroup $\{Q_t^D,\, t \geq 0\}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Since $G_D(x,y) = \overline{G}_D(x,y) h_D(y)$, by Theorem 3.6 in [5] and (7.6), $V_D(x,y)$ is comparable to $G_D(x,y)$ on $D \times D \setminus d$, where d denotes the diagonal of $D \times D$. From Theorem 3.4 [7] and the continuity of h_D, we see that $V_D(x,y)$ is continuous on $(D \times D) \setminus d$.

Let $u(x,y) := \mathbf{E}_x^y \left[e_A(\tau_D^y) \right]$ for $y \in D$, and define $u(x,w) := \mathbf{E}_x^w \left[e_A(\tau_D^w) \right]$ for $w \in \partial D$, where $\mathbf{E}_x^w$ is the expectation for the conditional process of X^D obtained through h-transform with $h(\cdot) = M(\cdot, w)$. Recall that $\partial_m D$ is the minimal Martin boundary of X^D.

Theorem 7.3 *The following properties hold.*

(1) For $w \in \partial_m D$ and $x \in D$, $\lim_{D \ni y \to w} u(x,y) = u(x,w)$. The conditional gauge function $u(x,w)$ is jointly continuous on $D \times \partial_m D$.

(2) For every $x \in D$ and $w \in \partial_m D$, $K_D(x,w) := \lim_{D \ni y \to w} \frac{V_D(x,y)}{V_D(x_0,y)}$ exists and is finite. Furthermore,

$$K_D(x,w) = M_D(x,w) \frac{u(x,w)}{u(x_0,w)} \tag{7.10}$$

and so $K(x,w)$ is jointly continuous on $D \times \partial_m D$;

(3) Assume D is a bounded $C^{1,1}$ domain and let $\rho_D(x)$ be the distance between x and ∂D, then there is a constant $c > 1$ such that

$$c^{-1} \frac{\rho_D(x)}{|x-w|^d} \le K_D(x,w) \le c\, \frac{\rho_D(x)}{|x-w|^d}. \tag{7.11}$$

Proof. (1) and (2) are proved in Theorem 3.4 in [7] (also see section 6 in [7] for the extension). Estimate (7.11) follows directly from (7.10) above and Theorem 7.7 in [14]. □

Definition 7.4 *A Borel function u defined on U is said to be ν-harmonic for X^D in an open subset U of D if*

$$\mathbf{E}_x \left[e_A(\tau_B) |u(X^D_{\tau_B})| \right] < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E}_x \left[e_A(\tau_B) u(X^D_{\tau_B}) \right] = u(x), \quad x \in B,$$

for every open set B whose closure is a compact subset of U. If $U = D$, then u is said to be ν-harmonic for X^D .

The following two theorems are proved in [7]. (Lemma 3.6, Theorems 5.11-5.12, Theorem 5.14-5.16 [7]. Also see section 6 in [7] for the extension.)

Theorem 7.5 *For every $z \in \partial_m D$, $x \mapsto K_D(x,z)$ is a minimal ν-harmonic function of X^D. That is, if h is a ν-harmonic function of X^D and $0 \le h(x) \le K_D(x,z)$, then $h(x) = cK_D(x,z)$ for some constant $c \le 1$. Moreover, for $z_1 \ne z_2 \in \partial_m D$, $K_D(\cdot, z_1) \not\equiv K_D(\cdot, z_2)$.*

Recall that a nonnegative Borel function f defined on D is said to be ν-excessive for X^D if for every $x \in D$ and $t > 0$, $Q^D_t f(x) \le f(x)$ and

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} Q^D_t f(x) = f(x).$$

Theorem 7.6 *The minimal Martin boundary for the Schrödinger semigroup* $\{Q_t^D, t \geq 0\}$ *can be identified with the minimal Martin boundary* $\partial_m D$ *of* X^D*. Furthermore for every* ν*-excessive function* f *of* X^D *that is not identically infinite, there is a unique Radon measure* μ_1 *on* D *and a unique finite measure* μ_2 *on* ∂D *such that*

$$f(x) = \int_D V_D(x,y)\mu_1(dy) + \int_{\partial_m D} K_D(x,z)\mu_2(dz). \tag{7.12}$$

Function f *is* ν*-harmonic for* X^D *if and only* $\mu_1 = 0$*.*

Conversely, if μ_1 *is a Radon measure in* D *such that* $\int_D V_D(x,y)\mu_1(dy)$ *is not identically infinite and* μ_2 *is finite measure on* ∂D*, then the function* f *given by (7.12) is a nonnegative* ν*-excessive function of* X^D *that is not identically infinite.*

Therefore we conclude that the minimal Martin boundary is stable under Feynman-Kac perturbation if $\nu \in \mathbf{S}_\infty(X^D)$ such the gauge function $x \mapsto \mathbf{E}_x\left[e_A(\tau_D)\right]$ is bounded. Furthermore we see that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the space of excessive functions (the space of positive harmonic functions) of X^D that are not identically infinite and the space of ν-excessive functions (the space of positive ν-harmonic functions, respectively) of X^D that are not identically infinite through measures μ_1 and μ_2.

Since the Martin measure μ_2 is finite and $K_D(x,z)$ is jointly continuous on $D \times \partial_m D$, we have the continuity for ν-harmonic functions of X^D.

Theorem 7.7 *If* $u \geq 0$ *is* ν*-harmonic for* X^D*, then* u *is continuous in* D*.*

In [15], we have shown that for every bounded Lipschitz domain D, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the minimal Martin boundary $\partial_m D$ for X^D and the Euclidean boundary ∂D (see Theorem 5.7 in [15]). Thus from Theorem 7.6, we have

Theorem 7.8 *For every bounded Lipschitz domain* D*, the (minimal) Martin boundary for the Schrödinger semigroup* $\{Q_t^D, t \geq 0\}$ *can be identified with the Euclidean boundary. Furthermore, for every* ν*-excessive function* f *of* X^D *that is not identically infinite,* ∂D *there is a unique Radon measure* μ_1 *on* D *and a unique finite measure* μ_2 *on* ∂D *such that*

$$f(x) = \int_D V_D(x,y)\mu_1(dy) + \int_{\partial D} K_D(x,z)\mu_2(dz). \tag{7.13}$$

Function f *is* ν*-harmonic for* X^D *if and only* $\mu_1 = 0$*.*

Remark 7.9 In [16], by using the Green function estimates and our Proposition 7.1, we show that, in fact, $\mathbf{K}_{d,2}$ is contained in $\mathbf{S}_\infty(X^D)$ if D is bounded Lipschitz.

References

[1] R. F. Bass, *Probabilistic Techniques in Analysis.* Springer-Verlag, 1995.

[2] R. F. Bass and Z.-Q. Chen, Brownian motion with singular drift. *Ann. Probab.* **31(2)** (2003), 791–817.

[3] R. M. Blumenthal and R. K. Getoor, *Markov Processes and Potential Theory.* Academic Press, 1968.

[4] K. Bogdan, The boundary Harnack principle for the fractional Laplacian. *Studia Math.* **123(1)** (1997), 43–80.

[5] Z.-Q. Chen, Gaugeability and conditional gaugeability. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **354** (2002), 4639–4679.

[6] Z.-Q. Chen and P. Kim, Green function estimate for censored stable processes. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **124** (2002), 595-610.

[7] Z.-Q. Chen and P. Kim, Stability of Martin boundary under non-local Feynman-Kac perturbations. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **128** (2004), 525-564.

[8] Z.-Q. Chen and R. Song, General gauge and conditional gauge theorems. *Ann. Probab.* **30** (2002), 1313-1339.

[9] Z.-Q. Chen, R. J. Williams and Z. Zhao, On the existence of positive solutions for semilinear elliptic equations with singular lower order coefficients and Dirichlet boundary conditions. *Math. Ann.* **315(4)** (1999), 735–769.

[10] K. L. Chung, M. Liao and K. M. Rao, Duality under a new setting, *Seminar on stochastic processes, 1983*, 23–38, Birkhaüser, Boston, 1984.

[11] K. L. Chung and K. M. Rao, A new setting for potential theory, *Ann Inst. Fourier* **30** (1980), 167–198.

[12] K. L. Chung and Z. X. Zhao, *From Brownian motion to Schrödinger's equation*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.

[13] K. L. Chung and J. B. Walsh, *Markov processes, Brownian motion, and time symmetry.* Springer, New York, 2005

[14] P. Kim and R. Song, Two-sided estimates on the density of Brownian motion with singular drift, to appear in the Doob-memorial volume of the Ill. J. Math., 2006.

[15] P. Kim and R. Song, Boundary Harnack principle for Brownian motions with measure-valued drifts in bounded Lipschitz domains, Preprint, 2006.

[16] P. Kim and R. Song, Estimates on Green functions and the Schrödinger-type equations for non-symmetric diffusions with measure-valued drifts, Preprint, 2006.

[17] P. Kim and R. Song, Intrinsic ultracontractivity of non-symmetric diffusion semigroups in bounded domains, Preprint, 2006.

[18] P. Kim and R. Song, Intrinsic ultracontractivity of non-symmetric diffusions with measure-valued drifts and potentials, Preprint, 2006.

[19] H. Kunita and T. Watanabe, Markov processes and Martin boundaries. *Ill. J. Math.* **9** (1965), 485–526.

[20] M. Liao, Riesz representation and duality of Markov processes, Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Mathematics, Stanford University, 1984.

[21] M. Liao, Riesz representation and duality of Markov processes, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, **1123**, 366–396, Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[22] L. Q. Liu and Y. P. Zhang, Representation of conditional Markov processes. *J. Math. (Wuhan)* **10(1)** (1990), 1–12.

[23] R. S. Martin, Minimal positive harmonic functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **49** (1941), 137–172.

[24] Z. R. Pop-Stojanović, Continuity of excessive harmonic functions for certain diffusions, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **103(2)** (1988), 607–611.

[25] Z. R. Pop-Stojanović, Excessiveness of harmonic functions for certain diffusions. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **2(4)** (1989), 503–508.

[26] D. Revuz, Mesures associés aux fonctionnelles additives de Markov. I, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **148** (1970), 501–531.

[27] L. Saloff-Coste, *Aspects of Sobolev-type inequalities.* Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[28] M. G. Shur, Dual Markov processes, *Teor. Verojatnost. i Primenen.* **22(2)** (1977), 264–278, English translation: *Theor. Probability Appl.* **22(2)** (1977), 257–270 (1978).

[29] J. C.Taylor, The Martin compactification associated with a second order strictly elliptic partial differential operator on a manifold M, In *Topics in probability and Lie groups: boundary theory*, 153–202, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, 28, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001.